

REMARKS

The Examiner in charge of this Application, Examiner Robinson, is thanked for the courtesies extended during the course of the interview on July 12, 2004. Although no firm agreement was reached during this interview, Applicant's representative was provided the opportunity to explain the invention and assert the patentability thereof. The following remarks reflect and expand upon the discussion of the invention that took place during this interview.

The cancellation of claims 1-9 and 18 have been made to comply with the Examiner's requirement regarding the election of claims 10-17 by the Applicant.

A new title has been provided and is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, as required by the Examiner.

The disclosure was objected to because of an informality that has been corrected by an amendment made to the specification. In particular, the character "s" was replaced with the character --a-- on page 17 to correct an obvious typographical error. Withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, it was stated that the claims contained subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. This rejection is hereby traversed and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

In particular, the Examiner stated that Applicant did not define what is meant by certain claim limitations, including "first class records, list state, first simple codes, perform

listing setting, overlapping values.” This objection has been obviated by the amendments made to claims 10-17 to provide terminology that clarifies the limitations. In particular, for example, first-class records has been changed to --first records--. The term “list state” has been changed to --listed state--. The “performing listing setting” has been changed to the term --degenerated--, meaning “convoluted or superposed to be reduced in number to, for instance, a simplex,” as is well-known in the use of physics and mathematics. “Overlapping values” simply means identical values, as would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art. These terms have been thus amended to clarify what is meant in claims 10-17.

With respect to Applicant’s description of the present invention, the Examiner considered certain portions of the specification to be unclear. However, it is respectfully submitted that such portions are clear so as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the present invention. The Examiner cited page 7, lines 5-29 with respect to Figure 1, stating that such a description is not clear. The Examiner states that Applicant gives an example of how the invention is implemented by citing Japanese unexamined Patent No. 11-012345, and other patents of this type, but the Examiner could find no such reference depicted in the drawings. The Examiner is correct in the understanding that Applicant’s description of first-class records is equated to bibliographical information data in which the Japanese unexamined Patent Publication 11-012345 is simply an example. Such examples of first-class identification codes appear throughout the specification, and one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that these references are considered to be examples, and not actual references to a disclosure. See, for example, page 8, lines 28-32. Three different first-class identification codes are listed at line 30-32 of page 8, with the qualifier “e.g.”, thereby signifying unequivocally to one of ordinary skill in the art that each of the references

are to be considered as examples, and not as references of disclosure. It is therefore asserted that the relationship is quite clear and described properly.

Similarly, Applicant's description of the code converter also is properly and sufficiently described. For example, in Figure 1, an identification code conversion unit 12 is clearly depicted. The steps of converting a first-class identification code into a second-class identification code is provided in Figure 3, for example, in step S-116. Also, the description of the code conversion would be such as to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to perform such code conversion with the conversion unit. The first-class identification codes PN are codes that are described as readily understood by a human, whereas the second-class identification codes serve as identification codes that are inherent in the second-class records. A comparison of the examples provided at page 8, lines 30-35 should make the differences between the first and second codes apparent. The drawings provide such a description of the example as to make the application complete.

For the above reasons, the rejection of claims 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be reconsidered and withdrawn, and such action is courteously solicited.

In light of the interview, amendments and remarks above, this application should be considered in condition for allowance and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this amendment of the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



John A. Hankins

Registration No. 32,029

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 JAH:MWE:idw
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: July 12, 2004

WDC99 946746-1.050195.0256